

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **5 July 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13-15, 17, 21-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hekmatpour (USPub 2005/0102596, hereinafter "Hekmatpour"). Claims 2-4, 8, 10-12, 16, 18-20, and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-25 were rejected as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 to replace the phrase "may contain" with the word "contains" to make it clear that the following phrase is part of the claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by Hekmatpour.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 to include allowable limitations from dependent claims 8, 16, and 24. Dependent claims 8, 16, and 24 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-15, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-23, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 18 July 2006

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: edward@parklegal.com